DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 521 SP 032 144

AUTHOR Zelazek, John R.; And Others
TITLE Evaluation and Dissemination: A Dynamic System To Keep Teacher Education Programs Meaningful.
PUB DATE Feb 90
NOTE 48p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Las Vegas, NV, February, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; College Faculty; Educational Assessment; Education Majors; Higher Education; *Program Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; Student Teachers; Surveys; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Central Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

This report represents the work of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University (CMSU), Warrensburg, Missouri. The TEAC is a multifaceted system that conducts and publishes results of periodic assessments and evaluations of CMSU's Teacher Education Programs by soliciting input from: (1) CMSU teacher education faculty; (2) preservice teacher education candidates; (3) inservice teachers and other graduates of the teacher education program; and (4) employers of educators prepared by CMSU. The results of all assessments and evaluations are then applied to the current teacher education program and shared with school districts that employ CMSU graduates. A description is provided of each of the four surveys: how it was conducted, the number of individuals responding, and the opinions it elicited. Seventeen conclusions drawn from the survey results are listed. Appendices include the TEAC charge; database elements; and results of faculty, graduate, employer, student teacher, and foundations surveys. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317521

Evaluation and Dissemination: A Dynamic System to Keep Teacher Education Programs Meaningful

A Paper Presented at The Association of Teacher Educators
Annual Convention, Las Vegas, Nevada
February, 1990

by

Dr. JOHN R. ZELAZEK
Dr. SHARON L. LAMSON
Dr. JIM SYLWESTER
Dr. BILL DOWNS

Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri, 64093-5086
(816)-429-4235
FAX 1-816-747-1653

SP032 144

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J.R. Zelazek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOPICS	PAGE
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
CURRENT ACTIVITIES	3
SURVEYS	4
FACULTY SURVEY	4
GRADUATE SURVEY	5
EMPLOYER SURVEY	6
STUDENT TEACHER SURVEY	6
FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION SURVEY	7
TEAC DATA BASE	8
DATA BASE CONCLUSIONS	8
CONCLUSIONS BASED ON 1989 SURVEYS:	10
FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION STUDENTS', STUDENT TEACHERS', FIRST AND SECOND YEAR TEACHERS', EMPLOYERS'	
RETROSPECT	13
APPENDIX 1 - TEAC CHARGE	14
APPENDIX 2 - DATA BASE ELEMENTS	16
APPENDIX 3 - FACULTY SURVEY RESULTS	19
APPENDIX 4 - GRADUATE SURVEY RESULTS	23
APPENDIX 5 - EMPLOYER SURVEY RESULTS	30
APPENDIX 6 - STUDENT TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS	35
APPENDIX 7 - FOUNDATIONS SURVEY RESULTS	42

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This report represents the work of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg, Missouri. TEAC was established in April of 1988 by the joint efforts of Dr. Joe Huber, Dean of the College of Education and Human Services and Dr. Jerry Miller, President of the Professional Education Faculty. TEAC's function and specific charges were devised (See Appendix 1) and individual committee members were chosen.

John R. Zelazek, Sharon L. Lamson, Jim Sylwester, Larry Jones, and Bob Ohrenberg comprised the original committee. Bill Downs has since replaced Bob Ohrenberg, and the seat held by Larry Jones has yet to be filled.

Central Missouri State University designed an assessment and evaluation system as part of its teacher education program as a result of the need for quality teachers in our nation. The Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) is a multifaceted system that conducts and publishes results of periodic assessments and evaluations of CMSU's Teacher Education Programs by soliciting input from: a) CMSU teacher education faculty, b) Pre-service teacher education candidates, c) In-service teachers and other graduates of the teacher education program, and d) Employers of educators prepared by CMSU. The results of all assessments and evaluations are then applied to the current teacher education program and shared with school districts that employ CMSU graduates.

TEAC and the Office of Institutional Research and Testing Services have jointly developed a data base of over 6,500 students. (See Appendix 2 for a listing of data base elements.) TEAC received an assessment grant from the CMSU assessment

committee which enabled a computer to link up with the CMSU mainframe with which to access and coordinate data with the Office of Clinical Services. TEAC has designed four major surveys based on the Technical Series 88-1 published by the National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University, Lansing, Michigan; and responded to the requests for summaries of student data based on individual criteria by the Department of Special Services, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Graduate Program, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Reading Program, the Department of Curriculum and Instruction Elementary Programs, and the Curriculum and Instruction NCATE task force for graduate programs for data and assistance. The response time for this data is very quick, most often just a few hours. The response time for the same data from the various other sources would be several days to several weeks. TEAC, now in its second year, has risen from a little known committee gathering data to a University entity that has high visibility and a major impact on teacher education programs at CMSU. From its extensive data base of student descriptors that has been gleaned from an eight year time span of enrollment, to its four additional data bases that are generated from the surveys of current students, graduates and employers, TEAC is now able to describe the nature of the students and perceptions of the teacher education program at CMSU.

During the past two years TEAC has also devised an "At-Risk" definition for college students and is monitoring the data base so that individual departments are made aware of their students' status. As of this writing, feedback from the departments or programs of Special Education, Biology, Earth Science, Child Development, Home Economics, Physical Science and Chemistry have been received. Each of these departments or programs has made contact with its At-Risk students and is working on individual case basis.

In addition to the AT-RISK information, TEAC is currently providing specific information to individual departments for use in the advisement and counseling of students. Demographic trends of teacher education classes, at both elementary and secondary levels, have been tallied, analyzed and distributed in order to help in load assessment, needs assessment, future planning for program adjustment, and personnel management. The use of TEAC survey data has been helpful to individual departments for program revision and course development, and to the University, so that it can look at the whole picture rather than fragmented pieces.

TEAC is also providing information that will be directly used for an upcoming NCATE, North Central, and The State of Missouri accreditation assessments. The tallies and survey results have been shared with the appropriate writing committees for the accreditation reports.

TEAC is not the "Watch Dog" of teacher education. TEAC is a centralized system of data collection and assessment that disseminates relevant data on a frequent and timely basis so that CMSU's dynamic system of teacher education is preparing professionals for the future.

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

The TEAC committee made a presentation of a paper entitled "Teacher Education for Future Generations: A Dynamic Process of Assessment and Evaluation" at the 1989 National Convention last February in St. Louis, Missouri, and has returned to the 1990 ATE National convention here in Las Vegas, Nevada, to present a progress report.

TEAC is currently working on its next set of surveys and began collection of data in October of 1989 and will conclude all surveying by May of 1990. The same format that was employed during the last set of data collection will be used and a report will be given to the CMSU Teacher Education Council by September of 1990.

TEAC is deeply indebted to Dean Joe Huber for his encouragement and financial support for the projects that have occurred and are planned.

SURVEYS

TEAC Faculty Survey

The TEAC faculty survey was sent to each member of the College of Education and Human Services faculty that taught a class which was directly related to, or required for, teacher certification. The survey statement was as follows: "You have been identified as a faculty member who contributes directly to the development of future teachers. What changes would you make, if any, to improve the current teacher education program. Also, if you have any additional comments related to the program would you please list them and return this survey to John R. Zelazek, Lovinger 300. Thank you."

The results of this survey included a total of 25 faculty members making 40 comments. (See Appendix 3 for survey results.) These comments ranged from suggestions for further data comparisons to program and course revisions to suggestions for improving the teacher education student selection criteria. There was a strong theme of assessment in the comments: assessment of courses, teaching style, students and funding.

TEAC Graduate Survey

In compliance with the Missouri's Excellence in Education Act of 1985, CMSU, solicits follow-up information concerning its first and second year Teacher Education graduates in addition to information from employers and supervisors of the graduates from CMSU's teacher education program. TEAC was able to secure the names, addresses, and schools of past first and second year teacher-certified graduates from the Office of Clinical Services. A special thanks is given to Dr. Gene Fields, Director of Clinical Services, and his secretary Linda Gable, for their assistance in this effort. In the State of Missouri, local school districts are paid $100 per first and second year teacher that is reported in the appropriate process. This is the key to the success of obtaining the list at the university level. A total of 322 first and second year teachers were listed based on the sets of demographic information received from their employers. Of the 322 sets of data, 235 graduated from CMSU between May of 1986 and the August 1988, 3 had received AA Degrees during that same time span, 31 completed post-bachelor teacher certification requirements between the Spring Semester of 1984 and the Summer Semester of 1988, and 53 individuals graduated from 1961 through 1986. An additional 71 teacher education students who graduated in December of 1988 were included as part of the sample.

From the 383 surveys sent out, 247 return responses were received (see Appendix 4 for a copy of the survey instrument and result tallies). The survey identified information concerning employment status, salary, graduate school plans, undergraduate training, and satisfaction levels. Finally, each respondent was asked to identify their goals of teaching. Most felt that they were better than average teachers and that the goal of teaching is to promote academic achievement.

TEAC Employer Survey

TEAC secured the names, addresses, and schools of the 200 principals who were the immediate supervisors of the 322 first and second year teachers described above. A random sample of 100 principals was chosen from the original listing. Surveys were sent to the 100 principals and 62 responses were received (see Appendix 5 for a copy of the survey instrument and result tallies). The questions to the administrators repeated many of the questions to the teachers. The administrators were asked about their perceptions of teachers employment status, salary, graduate school plans, undergraduate training, and satisfaction levels. They were asked if they would rehire these teachers and most said they would. When asked about themselves, most of the administrators stated that their undergraduate training had been in education and that they felt that they were better than average administrators. When asked about their goals, when stating a preferred goal, they differed from the teachers in that the administrators felt that enhancing personal development should be the primary goal.

TEAC Student Teacher Survey

TEAC surveyed the 1989 Spring Semester student teachers during their final evaluation conference on the CMSU campus. A total of 152 of the 170 student teachers responded. (See Appendix 6 for a copy of the survey instrument and result tallies.) A special thanks is expressed by the committee to Dr. Justyn Graham, Coordinator of Field Experiences, for his assistance in this effort. The average age for the student teachers was 27.0 years. This indicates a large number of non-traditional students preparing to student teach. This may have had an impact on the information collected. However, almost two thirds of the students were single and had no children. The student teachers rated their programs and compared general education courses

to teacher education courses. Most students thought that the quality of teacher education courses was higher than other courses. Other questions revolved around the student teaching experience and the relationship with the cooperating teachers. Approximately one-half of the students considered themselves better than average teachers and one third considered themselves excellent teachers. This is in contrast to the practicing professionals who mostly (66%) considered themselves better than average and only 13% considered themselves excellent. The last section of the survey addressed an evaluation of specific aspects of teacher skills. The skill area that received the highest rating by the new teachers was their ability to establish working relations with colleagues and other professionals with whom they work. The skill areas receiving the lowest rating and were not considered to be a skill were (1) understanding and using standardized tests and (2) teaching reading in their grade or subject area. The student teachers also identified diagnosing student learning difficulties, using computers in the classroom, and working with mainstreamed or other special needs students as areas where they were having significant problems.

TEAC Foundations of Education Survey

TEAC surveyed all five 1989 Spring Semester Foundations of Education sections. This course is a sophomore level course within the professional education block required for certification. A total of 155 students responded to our survey. (See Appendix 7 for a copy of the survey instrument and result tallies.) A special thanks is expressed to Dr. Gordon Bachus, Dr. Dick McKinnis, Dr. Audrey Wright, Dr. Pat Van Decar, and Dr. John R. Zelazek for their cooperation in this endeavor. The students in this class averaged 22.9 years of age and were mostly single, full-time students with no children. When asked what they perceived to be their strongest areas of knowledge and understanding, the areas with the highest rating were American

history and theories of how students learn. The area identified as weakest was classroom management. The students also identified three areas for which they wished a stronger background: math, classroom management, and legal and ethical responsibilities. When asked about the goals of education, these students responded in a similar manner to the practicing teachers, that promoting academic achievement was the primary goal.

TEAC DATA BASE

The TEAC data base was devised in consultation with the Office of Institutional Research and Testing Services. A special thanks must be expressed to the diligent work of Carol Nimmer who designed the programs and accessed the data TEAC requested from various university tapes for our project. (SEE appendix 2 for data base elements). The following conclusions are based on an examination of the 6,500 person data base and the comments from the Faculty Survey.

DATA BASE CONCLUSIONS

1. All Professional Semester applicants must meet all catalog requirements prior to the beginning of the Professional Semester. In the past three semesters 24 students went on to the professional semester without having met all of the requirements.

2. All ACT scores must be updated to the University tapes at frequent intervals.

3. CAT scores need to be listed on the University tapes and updated at frequent intervals.

4. Post-Bachelor students seeking certification need to be tracked and appear on the graduation list and University Fact sheet under a separate heading.

5. The total number of Major and Minor codes that are used by the University needs to be reduced.

6. Academic advisors must update any change of major or minor when a student registers each semester.

7. Academic advisors must update any student address or university status change when a student registers each semester.

8. A system to check prerequisites prior to a student enrolling in a class must be devised and followed, i.e., computer monitoring process at the time of enrollment for classes.

9. Teacher education students with a 2.5 GPA or less, a composite of an ACT of 20 or less, and 47 hours of university work or less are to be designated as "At Risk" and need to be supported through the University system. These quantifiers are based on C-BASE scores.

10. In-coming transfer teacher education students who have a 2.5 GPA or less, a composite score of 20 or less on the ACT and greater than 47 hours, should also be designated as "At Risk". These quantifiers are based on C-BASE scores.

11. More extensive field experiences are needed within all education classes, especially within the secondary programs where a field experience only takes place at

two levels, one of which is during the professional semester.

12. The skills of writing, reading, speaking, and computer usage must be taught, modeled, and shown how they can be applied to all classroom situations in the field.

CONCLUSIONS BASED ON THE 1989 FOUNDATIONS', STUDENT TEACHERS', FIRST AND SECOND YEAR GRADUATES' AND EMPLOYERS' SURVEYS

1. Foundations of Education students believe that the College of Education can improve its image through the training of better future teachers, and direct contact with current public school teachers and administrators.

2. Foundations of Education students believe they need to promote the academic achievement of students when they become teachers. (See item 14.)

3. Foundations of Education students believe they are strong in the areas of American history, child development, and the social sciences. The American history perception is not born out in actual C-BASE passing rates for elementary students.

4. Foundations of Education students believe they are weak in the areas of mathematics, Non-Western philosophies and cultures, multi-cultural issues, the social and political roles of schools, and the natural sciences.

5. Student teachers believe they need more work in the areas of computers, understanding standardized tests, teaching reading in their subject or grade area, diagnosing student learning difficulties, the use of professional literature, teaching

writing in their subject or grade area, making inferences about the way a student thinks, preparing educational media, planning stimulating and effective lessons, and knowledge of "At Risk" students.

6. According to student teachers, field experiences have contributed the most to their skill development as teachers.

7. Eighty percent of the student teachers feel that they are above average to exceptional teachers. This unusually high self-perception may cause them to be very disappointed in their first years of teaching when they encounter difficulties not seen in student teaching.

8. CMSU student teachers rated the quality of their education courses as higher than or equal to other required courses. This is probably due to their affinity to the content area and its relevance to their career choice.

9. CMSU student teachers rank the quality of their student teaching experience above their liberal arts/general education preparation.

10. CMSU student teachers rated their knowledge of "At Risk" students as adequate to weak. This indicates the need to continue discussing "At Risk" students and their needs in all of the education classes rather than just special education and psychology classes.

11. Without considering field experiences, CMSU graduates who are currently teaching believe that education courses have had only a modest to significant effect on their success as a teacher.

12. CMSU graduates who are currently teaching expect to be teaching 5 years from now, are satisfied with their salaries, opportunities for professional development, and level of support from parents and community. They are very satisfied with the interactions they have had with students.

13. Our teacher education graduates believe that promoting academic achievement is their main goal as a teacher. (See item 14.)

14. Principals of CMSU teacher education graduates believe very highly in enhancing personal development as a goal of education for an administrator. (See items 2 and 13.)

15. Without considering Field Experiences, principals of CMSU teacher education graduates believe that education courses have had a moderate to significant effect on the teaching success of their employees.

16. Principals of CMSU teacher education graduates expect them to teach in their present location for a least the next 5 years, and would still rehire our graduates if they had to go through the hiring process again.

17. Principals of CMSU graduates have stated that the teacher education program has had a moderate to strong contribution toward each graduate's level of preparation for their current job.

RETROSPECT

TEAC has existed for a very short period of time and has been able to accomplish all charges given through the dedication of its committee members, and the direct support of those CMSU professional staff and faculty with which it has had contact . TEAC will continue to serve Central Missouri State University to its fullest capacity.

APPENDIX 1

I. Function

A. Global Charge

The Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEA) of the Teacher Education Council shall conduct and publish results of periodic assessments of CMSU Teacher Education programs by soliciting input from: a) CMSU teacher education faculty, b) pre-service teacher education candidates, c) in-service teachers and other graduates of our teacher education programs, and d) employers of educators prepared at CMSU.

B. Specific Charges

1. TEA shall keep the teacher education unit (Professional Education Faculty (PEF) through the Teacher Education Council (TEC)) abreast of emerging evaluation techniques and engage in regular and systematic evaluations, including follow-up studies, to determine the success and quality of graduates in the professional education roles for which they were prepared (Criterion for Compliance #33, P. 42 of NCATE Standards).

2. TEA shall compile and disseminate results of evaluation efforts, including follow-up studies of graduates for use by the unit to modify and improve programs (Criterion #34, p. 42 of NCATE Standards).

II. Procedures

A. Composition (Minimum of 5 members)

1. At least one member from each academic college, plus a chair.

2. TEA may recommend that additional members be added by the TEC.

B. Selection

1. Faculty members shall be appointed by the chair of the TEC, in consultation with the Dean of Education and Human Services, from the PEF pool.

2. Chair shall be designated by the TEC chair in consultation with the Dean of Education and Human Services.

C. Term of Service

1. The four college members will serve staggered terms of two years and may succeed themselves once.

2. The chair will serve at the discretion of the TEC.

D. Frequency and Dissemination of Reports.

1. Assessment shall take place at least once every two years.

2. Results of assessment surveys shall be reported to the TEC and the Dean of Education and Human Services.

APPENDIX 2

Education Majors Assessment Project:
Database Element Layout and Definitions

)atabase Elements:

SSNO: Student ID Number (social security)
NAME
HSPCTL: High School Percentile Rank
(NRA = No Rank Available
GED = General Education Development certificate)
ACT: ACT Composite Score
TRANSFER: Transfer Status
(1 = Transfer
2 = Not a Transfer
3 = Transfer -- Graduate
4 = Not a Transfer -- Graduate)
MJRCODE1: Most Recent Major Code (first) Delcared
MJRCODE2: Most Recent Major Code (second) Delcared
MNRCODE: Most Recent Minor Code Delcared
DGRCODE: Most Recent Degree Code Delcared
RANK: Current (or Final) CMSU Class Rank
(1 = Freshman
2 = Sophomore
3 = Junior
4 = Senior
5 = Masters
6 = Education Specialist
7 = Post Baccalaureate -- Undergraduate
8 = No Degree -- Graduate)
FRSTTERM: Year/Semester entered CMSU -- Beginning 84/1
(1 = Summer Semester
2 = Fall Semester
4 = Spring Semester)
LASTTERM: Year/Semester last enrolled at CMSU -- Through 88/1
PROBCODE: Current (or Final) Probation/Suspension Status
(01 = Not on Probation
02 = Placed on Academic Probation
03 = Continued on Academic Probation
04 = Suspended for Academic Reasons
05 = Dismissed for Academic Reasons
06 = Removed from Academic Probation
07 = Continued (Previously Suspended) -- Needs 2.00
08 = Admitted or Re-Admitted on Probation
(Previously Suspended) -- Needs 2.00
09 = Graduate Ineligible
UGRADGPA: Current (or Final) Undergraduate Cumulative GPA
UGRADHRS: Current Undergraduate Cumulative Hours Earned
GRADGPA: Current (or Final) Graduate Cumulative GPA
GRADHRS: Current Graduate Cumulative Hours Earned
DEGRYR1: Year/Semester First CMSU Degree Received
DGCODRN1: Degree Code for First CMSU Degree Received
MJRCODE3: Major Code (first) for First CMSU Degree Received
MJRCODE4: Major Code (second) for First CMSU Degree Received
DEGRYR2: Year/Semester Second CMSU Degree Received

DGCODRN2: Degree Code for Second CMSU Degree Received
MJRCODE5: Major Code for Second CMSU Degree Received
DEGRYR3: Year/Semester Third CMSU Degree Received
DGCODRN3: Degree Code for Third CMSU Degree Received
MJRCODE6: Major Code for Third CMSU Degree Received
CAT: California Achievement Test (To be Added)
NELSON: Nelson-Denny Test (To be Added)
CBASE: College Basic Academic Subject Examination (To be Added)

Database Creation/Update Procedures Used:

1. Original Database Includes Students Enrolled S4/1 through
   Selected on Degree Codes (BSE, BME, MSE, EdS)
   Selected also on class lists for the following courses:
   C&I 1150, 2100
   EDCI (EDTE in 1984) 4495, 4496, 4595, 4596
   EDSP 4395, 4396

2. Update Database at end of each Spring Semester

Office of Institutional Research & Testing Services

January 3, 1989

APPENDIX 3

TEACHER EDUCATION ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

FACULTY SURVEY

MAY 2, 1988

During the month of April of 1988, the Teacher Education Assessment Committee surveyed the College of Education and Human Services Faculty that a directly involved with Teacher Education Programs, for their comments and suggestions concerning our current programs. A total of 25 individual responses were received with 40 different comments. The following list is an accounting of those comments.

1. Compare the drop out rate for freshman Education majors vs. the general college rate.

2. Follow-up questions: Do the new professionals fit in?, and Are they adequately prepared? Look at questions from both teacher and administration point of view.

3. Decide what the mission for teacher education should be.

4. Screen more carefully and stringently at entry into teacher education.

5. Foundations of Education are misplaced. Too much too soon.

6. Need a closer link between content and methods. Need to team teach them and coordinate work.

7. Student teaching is being improved for elementary education but not secondary by going to full semester student teaching.

8. Follow-up should include classroom observation: can they teach, do they have interpersonal skills. Follow-up should also ask teachers what they think they didn't get.

9. We need to actively recruit top freshmen to CMSU and to teacher education.

10. Find out why we lose them, drop out of college and change majors.

11. Need to block classes more, e.g., Language Arts, Reading, and Children's Literature.

12. Problems with Secondary Education: Are the Students computer literate? Is there any progress since the last survey was taken in computer literacy. Need to do a follow-up study similar to the elementary one. Look at EDCI 4150, is it the way we want it and will it include secondary Education? Need to tie elementary and secondary requirements together for consistency. Need to evaluate field experience process. Need more the sophomore field experience and 25 hours of observation. "Secondary Education is a mess".

13. Set up alternative for marginal students.

14. Faculty needs paid time to counsel and interview entry level students.

15. Assess correctly or not at all.

16. Tighten up teacher education requirements.

17. Create and use attitudinal profile.

18. Need financial support from University and State for assessment.

19. Screen out students with "poor attitudes". They need to be able to relate to others with human dignity and value.

20. Coordinate a relationship between perspective teachers and prospective administrators.

21. Do a longitudinal follow-up of grades in particular classes.

22. Look for leadership skills.

23. Need continuous monitoring of criteria towards exit criteria.

24. Want cream of the crop, not anybody who "just wants to teach".

25. Are students learning what we teach them?

26. Encourage the "Art" of teaching as well as the "Science".

27. Students can't write, grammar and penmanship, some faculty can't either, so they can't help or model for students.

28. Assess attitude, affective domain, as well as achievement and effort.

29. Create a rating scale to be used in every course to create a longitudinal look for each student, time by professor. Create a cumulative score.

30. Assess faculty: do multiple teachers of the same course teach the same basic content?

31. Coordinate among faculty to reduce repetition of content.

32. Screen freshmen with more in depth interviews in regards to personality suited to working with children. Redirect marginal students.

33. Give more practical experience.

34. Methods courses sooner.

35. Children's literature is poorly taught. Best classes are Language Arts and Math taught by Dr. Hampton. These tie methods to content.

36. Professors on probation for several years should not be teaching.

37. Want student evaluations to have some meaning. Graph professors over time.

38. Professors need to be responsible for their action, so should the classroom teachers.

39. Follow-up should be by compassionate and known University people.

40. Tighten screening of student teachers.

APPENDIX 4

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE, FILL-IN OR CHOOSE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM. (TEAC-GRAD-SPRING-1989)

1. Gender: (47) male (195) female 2. Age: _28__years

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   (134) single (103) married (4) widowed, separated, or divorced

4. What was your annual salary/income in the first teaching job you held after college?

   (6) less than $10,000
   (16) $10,000 - $12,999
   (11) $13,000 - $15,999
   (158) $16,000 - $18,999
   (31) $19,000 - $21,999
   (5) $22,000 - $24,999
   (1) $25,000 - $27,999
   (1) $28,000 or beyond

5. How would you describe yourself?

   (10) American Indian, or Alaskan Native
   (0) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (2) Black, non-Hispanic
   (4) Hispanic
   (225) White, non-Hispanic
   (1) Other

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   (213) full-time student (26) sometimes full-time/part-time
   (1) part-time student

7. When did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

   (11) fall 1984 to summer 1985
   (14) fall 1985 to summer 1986
   (75) fall 1986 to summer 1987
   (111) fall 1987 to summer 1988
   (36) other

8. How many children do you have?

   (162) zero (25) one (30) two (18) three (8) more than three

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education?

   (178) Yes (42) Not Sure (20) No

10. Do you plan to do your graduate work at CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY?

    (123) Yes (83) Not Sure (34) No

11. Which of the following provides the best description of the kind of work you currently do?

(207) classroom teacher
(1) teacher/trainer in a non-school setting
(8) in education, but not teaching
(1) provide social services
(2) self-employed
(2) student
(2) homemaker
(2) temporarily laid off/unemployed
(15) other

If you checked (1) or (3) above, please skip to Part B #17.
If not, please answer Part A, then skip to GENERAL INDICES #26.

PART A (Nonteachers)

12. Why aren't you teaching at the present time?

(2) teaching was not my first choice of careers at the time I began looking for a job
(5) a teaching position was not available in the geographical area where I hoped to reside
(4) I tried, but couldn't find a teaching position anywhere
(0) I was offered a more rewarding job within the field of education (e.g., school administrator)
(0) I was offered a better job outside of education
(0) I wanted to continue my education
(1) I needed to attend to home/family affairs
(8) other (please specify)

13. Do you regret you are not teaching?

(13) Yes (5) No

14. If you are currently employed, do you feel you are under-employed?

(15) Yes (7) No

15. What are your employment plans for next year?

(5) remain in current job
(15) try to find a job as a teacher
(1) try to find some other job in education
(1) change to a different job that is not in education
(0) leave the work force temporarily (e.g. to care for a family)
(0) leave the work force permanently
(0) undecided
(1) other (specify)

16. To what extent did the work you completed in your teacher education program contribute to your level of preparation for your current job?

(6) strong contribution
(7) moderate contribution
(6) minor contribution
(5) no contribution

PART B TEACHERS

17. How would you describe your current position in education?

(197) full-time teacher
(3) permanent substitute
(7) part-time teacher
(9) day to day substitute teacher
(5) education specialist (e.g., math coordinator, librarian)
(0) school administrator/supervisor
(4) other

If you are a full-time teacher or permanent sub, please continue. All others, please skip to Section III.

18. At what grade level do you teach?

(17) preschool/kindergarten
(58) early elementary/grades 1-3
(31) upper elementary/grades 4-6
(35) middle school/jr. high
(43) senior high school
(32) more than one level/k-12

19. Is this the level at which you prefer to teach? (173) Yes (23) No

20. (a) What subject(s) do you teach? (check all that apply)

__4_Agriculture
_14_Art
__9_Biology
__8_Business
__3_Chemistry
_11_Civics/Government
_10_Computer Science
__2_Distributive Ed/Marketing
_30_Earth Science
_81_Elementary
_46_English/Language Arts
_11_Foreign Language
_34_General Science
_34_Health
_15_Home Economics
_28_History
__4_Industrial Arts/Voc.Ed.
__9_Journalism
_55_Mathematics
_14_Music
_18_Physical Education
_12_Physical Sciences/Physics
_28_Pre K-3
_51_Reading
_21_Social Sciences/Psychology
_19_Special Education
__8_Speech/Theatre
_21_Other_____

(b) What was your undergraduate major? 37% were elementary education majors, all other listings were less than 10% per discipline

21. About what percent of your present teaching assignment is in the grade(s) or subject area(s) in which you were certified/endorsed?

(182) 100% (13) 75% (9) 50% (10) 25% or less

22. For how long have you been teaching full time?

(114) less than one year (22) 2 to 3 years
(69) 1 to 2 years (9) more than 3 years

23. Five years from now, do you plan to be

(176) teaching
(9) an educational specialist (math consultant, librarian)
(8) a school administrator
(11) employed outside the field of education
(9) temporarily out of the work force (e.g., to care for a family, to continue your education)
(0) permanently out of the work force
(5) other

24. How much longer do you expect to teach?

(23) less than five years (42) 5-10 years
(58) 11-20 years (92) more than 20 years

25. During the past year, have you been employed in some capacity other than your regular teaching assignment?

(103) No If Yes, how would you describe your other source(s) of income? (circle all that apply)

(37) coaching
(31) other school-related assignments during the school year
(16) employment outside the school system during the school year
(4) school-related job during the summer
(26) employment outside the school system during the summer

GENERAL INDICES

26. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

(121) definitely yes (18) probably not
(93) probably yes (5) definitely not

27. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current teaching positions.

KEY:
1 = very satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neutral; 4 = dissatisfied; 5 = very dissatisfied

__2.1_ salary/fringe benefits
__1.5_ quality/level of administrative support
__1.5_ level of personal/professional challenge
__1.5_ methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
__1.5_ your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion
__1.7_ general work conditions (hours, work load, class size)
__2.0_ intellectual stimulation of the workplace
__2.0_ geographical location
__2.1_ opportunities for professional advancement
__2.1_ level of support from parents and the community
__1.9_ level of support from administrators and colleagues
__1.9_ interactions with colleagues
__1.3_ interactions with students

28. Do you plan to transfer to a different school or to look for a different job next year?

(124) No (57) Possibly (55) Yes

29. To what extent have education courses (other than field-based experiences such as student teaching) contributed to your success as a teacher?

These courses have made a(n) _____ contribution to my success.

(11) critical (89) significant (113) modest (26) insignificant

30. At the time you completed your teacher preparation program, how would you have rated the adequacy of your preparation to teach in a culturally diverse setting with at-risk students?

(37) very weak (106) weak (74) adequate (21) strong (3) very strong

31. Did you major in education as an undergraduate?

(212) Yes If No, to what extent were non-education courses in your major adapted to the needs of teachers?

Were these courses ...

(21) well adapted to the needs of teachers
(11) moderately relevant
(7) largely irrelevant

32. Do you feel you are a(n) ...

(32) exceptional teacher
(154) better than average teacher
(45) average teacher
(1) below average teacher
(0) inferior teacher

General goals of schooling include:

Promoting academic development (e.g., gaining academic knowledge & understanding; developing critical thinking and problem solving skills)

Enhancing personal development (e.g., learning to cope with emotional stress; developing a sense of dignity and self-worth)

Facilitating social development (e.g., learning to get along with others; developing and appreciation for one's own and other cultures)

33. In thinking about your own goals as a teacher, does one of these stand out as clearly more important than the others?

(118) No If Yes, which one?

(65) promoting academic achievement
(50) enhancing personal development
(11) facilitating social development

34. In thinking about your own goals as a teacher, does one of these stand out as clearly less important than the others?

(185) No If Yes, which one?

(17) promoting academic achievement
(8) enhancing personal development
(18) facilitating social development

APPENDIX 5

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE, FILL-IN OR CHOOSE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM.(TEAC-EMPLOYER-SPRING-1989)

1. How many CMSU graduates did you employ this school year as first or second year teachers? 114

   Gender: (29) males (88) females

2. What is their annual individual salary on average?

(1)	less than $10,000	(8)	$19,000 - $21,999
(1)	$10,000 - $12,999	(0)	$22,000 - $24,999
(0)	$13,000 - $15,999	(0)	$25,000 - $27,999
(48)	$16,000 - $18,999	(0)	$28,000 or beyond

3. How would you describe them? Please list a number for each.

(0)	American Indian, or Alaskan Native	(0)	Hispanic
(0)	Asian or Pacific Islander	(117)	White, non-Hispanic
(0)	Black, non-Hispanic	(0)	Other

4. Do they plan to do their graduate work in education? Please give a number for each choice.

   (71) Yes (57) Not Sure (3) No

5. Do they plan to do their graduate work at CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY? Please give a number for each choice.

   (36) Yes (75) Not Sure (7) No

6. Do they regret they are teachers? Please give a number for each choice.

   (9) Yes (108) No

7. To what extent did the work they completed in their teacher education program contribute, on average, to their level of preparation for their current job?

(29)	strong contribution	(2)	minor contribution
(27)	moderate contribution	(0)	no contribution

8. How would you describe their current positions in education? Please list numbers for each position.

(110) full-time teacher
(0) permanent substitute
(4) part-time teacher
(1) day to day substitute teacher
(0) education specialist (e.g., math coordinator, librarian)
(0) school administrator/supervisor
(0) other_____

9. What subject(s) do they teach? (please list numbers for all that apply)

_1__Agriculture
_2__Art
_4__Biology
_4__Business
_3__Chemistry
_2__Civics/Government
_6__Computer Science
_1__Distributive Ed/Marketing
_4__Earth Science
_44_Elementary
_18_English/Language Arts
_2__Foreign Language
_5__General Science
_5__Health
_4__Home Economics
_1__History
_1__Industrial Arts/Voc.Ed.
_3__Journalism
_11_Mathematics
_8__Music
_6__Physical Education
_4__Physical Sciences/Physics
_2__Pre K-3
_2__Reading
_1__Social Sciences/Psychology
_9__Special Education
_1__Speech/Theatre
_2__Other_____

10. Are any of your first or second year teachers teaching in areasin which they are not certified or endorsed?

(2) 100% (4) 75% (1) 50% (49) 25% or less

11. How much longer do you expect them to teach in their present location and assignment (on average)?

(27) less than five years (20) 5-10 years (2) 11-20 years (3) more than 20 years

12. If you had it to do over again, would you still hire these teachers? Please list a number by each response.

(87) definitely yes
(8) probably not
(26) probably yes
(4) definately not

13. Please rate your perception of your new teachers' level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of their current teaching positions.

KEY: 1 = very satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neutral; 4 = dissatisfied; 5 = very dissatisfied

_2.3_ salary/fringe benefits
_1.8_ quality/level of administrative support
_2.0_ level of personal/professional challenge
_1.8_ methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
_1.9_ your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion
_2.0_ general work conditions (hours, work load, class size)
_2.2_ intellectual stimulation of the workplace
_1.9_ geographical location
_2.2_ opportunities for professional advancement
_2.4_ level of support from parents and the community
_1.7_ level of support from administrators and colleagues
_1.5_ interactions with colleagues
_1.8_ interactions with students

14. To what extent have education courses (other than field-based experiences such as student teaching) contributed to their success as a teacher? Please list numbers for each choice.

(8) critical (50) significant (45) modest (3) insignificant

ABOUT YOU

15. At the time you completed your teacher preparation program, how would you have rated the adequacy of your preparation to teach in a culturally diverse setting with at-risk students?

(11) very weak (16) weak (16) adequate (14) strong (1) very strong

16. Did you major in education as an undergraduate?

(18) Yes If No, to what extent were non-education courses in your major adapted to the needs of teachers?

Were these courses ...

(1) well adapted to the needs of teachers
(7) moderately relevant
(3) largely irrelevant

17. Do you feel you are a(n) ...

(12) exceptional administrator
(41) better than average administrator
(5) average administrator
(0) below average administrator
(0) inferior administrator

General goals of schooling include:

Promoting academic development (e.g., gaining academicknowledge & understanding; developing critical thinking and problem solving skills)

Enhancing personal development (e.g., learning to cope with emotional stress; developing a sense of dignity and self-worth)

Facilitating social development (e.g., learning to get along with others; developing and appreciation for one's own and other cultures)

18. In thinking about your own goals as an adminstrator, does one of these stand out as clearly more important than the others?

(26) No If Yes, which one?

(1) promoting academic achievement
(24) enhancing personal development
(7) facilitating social development

19. In thinking about your own goals as an administrator, does one of these stand out as clearly less important than the others?

(41) No If Yes, which one?

(4) promoting academic achievement
(3) enhancing personal development
(8) facilitating social development

APPENDIX 6

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE, FILL-IN OR CHOOSE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM. (TEAC-STUDENT-TEACHERS-1989)

1. Gender: (30) male (122) female

2. Age: __27.0__years

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

   (91) single (55) married (5) widowed, separated, or divorced

4. How would you describe yourself?

   (4) American Indian, or Alaskan Native
   (0) Hispanic
   (0) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (144) White, non-Hispanic
   (2) Black, non-Hispanic
   (1) Other

5. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   (133) full-time student (4) part-time student (9) sometimes full-time/part-time

6. When will you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

   (133) fall 1988 to summer 1989
   (15) fall 1989 to summer 1990
   (2) fall 1990 to summer 1991
   (2) fall 1991 to summer 1992
   (2) Other

7. How many children do you have?

   (101) zero (22) one (12) two (10) three (6) more than three

8. On a scale of one to seven, how would you rate the overall quality of:

	WEAK STRONG
5.11 your teacher preparation program	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.19 courses in your undergraduate major field	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.68 the liberal arts/general education courses you have taken	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6.08 your student teaching experience	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.59 advice/counselling you received from your academic advisor (in your major field of study)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.38 support, assistance, and general help from faculty and staff in your teacher education program	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. How did the quality of the courses you were required to takein education compare with that of courses you were required to take in other areas? Was it _____ that of other required courses?

(15) far higher than (64) higher than (52) equal to
(17) lower than (2) far lower than

10. To what extent is your style of teaching consistent with that of your supervising/cooperating teacher (during student teaching)?

(44) very consistent (75) consistent (21) inconsistent (9) very inconsistent

11. To what extent did your views of the professional roles and responsibilities of teachers change from the time you entered your teacher education program to program completion?

(19) a lot (45) quite a bit (59) some (24) not much (1) not at all

12. To what extent have education courses (other than field-based experiences such as student teaching) contributed to your success as a teacher?

These courses have made a(n) _____ contribution to my success.

(8) critical (87) significant (44) modest (8) insignificant

13. At the time you completed your teacher preparation program, how would you have rated the adequacy of your preparation to teach in a culturally diverse setting with at-risk students?

    (11) very weak (43) weak (61) adequate (27) strong (5) very strong

14. Do you feel you are a(n) ...

    (50) exceptional teacher
    (73) better than average teacher
    (20) average teacher
    (3) below average teacher
    (2) inferior teacher

15. How would you have rated the overall adequacy of your skills (Q.17) in each of the following areas at the time you completed your teacher preparation program:

    (5) weak (55) adequate (74) strong

16. What helped you the most in the over all development of each skill (Q.17) (select one):

    (11) courses in education
    (77) field experiences in your teacher education program
    (51) some other sources (e.g., personal experience)?

This next section has two portions for each stem.

I. Rating of the adequacy of your teaching skills in this area?

WEAK=1 ADEQUATE=2 STRONG=3

II. What helped you most in developing this skill?

EDUCATION COURSES=EC, FIELD EXPERIENCE=FE, OTHER=O
Select one from each row for each question.

1 2 3 (a) plan stimulating and effective lessons.
EC FE O 1.8-72,52,77

1 2 3 (b) select, prepare and use educational media
EC FE O 1.8-31,56,58

1 2 3 (c) teach problem solving, conceptual understanding, andother
EC FE O understanding, and other aspects of higher-order thinking
1.8-24,60,61

1 2 3 (d) enhance students' sense of personal achievement and self-worth
EC FE O 2.2-13,40,92

1 2 3 (e) motivate students to participate in academic tasks
EC FE O 2.0-13,59,72

1 2 3 (f) use computers in instruction
EC FE O 1.7-46,41,50

1 2 3 (g) understand and use standardized tests
EC FE O 1.6-38,58,41

1 2 3 (h) use community resources
EC FE O 2.0-29,57,58

1 2 3 (i) establish effective working relations with colleagues and
EC FE O other professionals with whom you work
2.3-11,52,83

1 2 3 (j) refer students for special assistance when appropriate
EC FE O 2.0-20,65,58

1 2 3 (k) assess and improve your own performance as a teacher
EC FE O 2.1-14,48,83

1 2 3 (l) account for, and build on, students/ cultural and academic
EC FE O diversity in the instruction you offer
2.0-22,67,54

1 2 3 (m) work with parents
EC FE O 2.2-20,58,63

1 2 3 (n) work with gifted and talented students
EC FE O 2.0-33,68,46

1 2 3 (o) work with mainstreamed or other special needs students
EC FE O 1.9-29,59,54

1 2 3 (p) adapt instruction and/or materials to address varyingneeds
EC FE O and achievements of individual students
2.0-21,60,62

WEAK=1 ADEQUATE=2 STRONG=3
EDUCATION COURSES=EC, FIELD EXPERIENCE=FE, OTHER=O

1 2 3 (q) create a learning environment in which students function as
EC FE O responsible and autonomous learners
2.0-15,61,68

1 2 3 (r) make inferences about students' congnitive and metacognitive
EC FE O processes (i.e., the ways they think)
1.8-26,79,38

1 2 3 (s) respond appropriately to disruptive student behaviors
EC FE O 2.1-11,59,73

1 2 3 (t) teach reading in your grade or subject area
EC FE O 1.6-29,52,55

1 2 3 (u) teaching writing in your grade or subject area
EC FE O 1.8-32,49,55

1 2 3 (v) recognize your strenghs and limitations as a teacher
EC FE O 2.2-7,55,82

1 2 3 (w) design/interpret measures of student work and achievement
EC FE O 1.9-12,55,76

1 2 3 (x) monitor students' progress and adjust instruction accordingly
EC FE O 2.0-12,53,80

1 2 3 (y) diagnose students' learning difficulties
EC FE O 1.8-31,53,51

1 2 3 (z) plan and implement a successful first week of school
EC FE O 1.9-28,67,47

1 2 3 (aa) assess the expectations of the community and school
EC FE O administration (e.g., how teachers are likely to be judged)
2.0-22,71,50

1 2 3 (bb) develop and/or represent a given concept or idea in a idea
EC FE O idea in a variety of ways (alternative explanations, metaphors, graphs,
pictures, manipulatives)
1.9-17,59,67

1 2 3 (cc) maintain high expectations for student achievement
EC FE O 2.1-11,38,96

1 2 3 (dd) locate and use the professional literature in addressing
EC FE O problems or issues you encounter in teaching
1.8-26,53,63

18. Do any of the skills listed in Q. 17 represent areas in which you are experiencing problems frustrations in your student teaching assignment?

(103) No

(49) Yes -- Please identify the THREE areas that pose the most significant problems or frustrations. Write the letters corresponding to these areas here:

_____ _____ _____

The four areas listed most were: Diagnosing student learning difficulties, use computers in instruction, understand and use standardized tests, and work with mainstreamed or other special needs students.

APPENDIX 7

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE, FILL-IN OR CHOOSE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM. (TEAC-FOUNDATIONS-1989)

Gender: 1. (50) male
2. (105) female

AGE: 3. _22.9__years

4. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

(65) single
(18) married
(4) widowed, separated, or divorced

5. How would you describe yourself?

(0) American Indian, or Alaskan Native
(1) Hispanic
(0) Asian or Pacific Islander
(149) White, non-Hispanic
(5) Black, non-Hispanic
(0) Other _____

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

(149) full-time student
(5) part-time student
(9) sometimes full-time; part-time

7. When do you plan to complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

(10) fall 1989 to summer 1990
(55) fall 1990 to summer 1991
(6) fall 1991 to summer 1992
(8) fall 1992 to summer 1993
(0) other

8. How many children do you have?

(125) zero
(12) one
(7) two
(7) three
(3) more than three

9. How would you have rated the adequacy of your knowledge and understanding in each of the following areas. Your knowledge and understanding of:

		weak	adequate	strong
(1.98)	mathematics	1	2	3
(2.23)	social sciences	1	2	3
(2.00)	natural sciences	1	2	3
(1.99)	multi-cultural issues and perspectives	1	2	3
(1.75)	non-Western philosophies and cultures	1	2	3
(2.27)	American history and literature	1	2	3
(2.25)	the historical and philosophical development of thought in your major field of study	1	2	3
(2.13)	contemporary educational issues	1	2	3
(2.27)	theories/principles of how students learn	1	2	3
(2.26)	child/adolescent growth and development	1	2	3
(1.47)	social and political roles of schools in American society	1	2	3
(1.11)	classroom management techniques procedures	1	2	3
(2.04)	legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	1	2	3

10. Thinking in terms of your current role as a student, do you wish you had a stronger background in any of the areas of knowledge listed in Q. 9 above?

(15) No
(136) Yes -- Please identify the THREE areas in which a stronger background would be most helpful. Write the letters corresponding to these areas here:

_____ _____ _____

The three areas were: Math, Classroom Management, and Legal and Ethical responsibilities.

11. Please list the FIVE areas of knowledge listed in Q. 9 above that you would rate as most essential to your current success in becoming a teacher:

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

The five areas were: Theories of Learning, Child Development, Classroom Management, Legal and Ethical responsibilities, and historical and philosophical grounding in their major field of study.

GENERAL GOALS OF SCHOOLING INCLUDE:

Promoting academic development (e.g., gaining academic knowledge and understanding; developing critical thinking and problem solving skills)

Enhancing personal development (e.g., learning to cope with emotional stress; developing a sense of dignity and self-worth)

Facilitating social development (e.g., learning to get along with others; developing and appreciation for one's own and other cultures)

12. In thinking about your own goals as a teacher, does one of these stand out as clearly more important than the others?

(62) No If yes, which one?

(46) promoting academic achievement
(27) enhancing personal development
(13) facilitating social development

13. In thinking about your own goals as a student, does one of these stand out as clearly less important than the others?

(122) No If yes, which one?

(8) promoting academic achievement
(7) enhancing personal development
(12) facilitating social development